INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION/Fair Tax Cut Distribution

SUBJECT: Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 1998 . . . S. 858. Wellstone amendment No. 415.

ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 99-0

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. 858, the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 1998, will authorize appropriations for intelligence activities and programs of the U.S. Government, the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and the Community Management Account of the Director of Central Intelligence.

The Wellstone amendment would express the sense of the Senate that "any tax legislation enacted by the Congress this year should meet a standard of fairness in its distributional impact on upper, middle, and lower income taxpayers, and that any such legislation should not disproportionately benefit the highest income taxpayers."

Those favoring the amendment contended:

Our Republican colleagues in the Finance Committee are putting together a tax cut bill that will disproportionately help their rich supporters. The most objectionable part of their bill is that it will lower the capital gains tax. That cut will just make the rich richer. Forty percent of stocks and bonds in America are held by the richest 1 percent of Americans, and the next 5 percent hold most of the rest. The stocks and bonds held by non-wealthy Americans are held mostly through pension plans, annuities, and life insurance savings, and are already exempt from the capital gains tax. Thus, our colleagues are insisting on a windfall for very wealthy Americans. At the same time, the main benefit that they are proposing for working Americans, the child tax credit, will not benefit all families because many families will not have incomes high enough to take the credit. In fact, the bottom 40 percent of the population will be ineligible to take the credit. We do not believe that this plan meets the fairness test. Therefore, we have offered the Wellstone amendment, which we suspect will receive overwhelming support. This amendment simply says that the benefits of any tax cut bill that is enacted should be distributed fairly across all income levels. After Senators vote for this amendment, and the

(See other side) **YEAS (99)** NAYS (0) NOT VOTING (1) **Democrats** Republican Republicans **Democrats** Republicans **Democrats** (55 or 100%) (44 or 100%) (0 or 0%) (0 or 0%)(0)**(1)** Daschle-4 Abraham Hutchinson Akaka Johnson Allard Hutchison Baucus Kennedy Ashcroft Inhofe Biden Kerrev Jeffords Bennett Bingaman Kerry Bond Kempthorne Boxer Kohl Brownback Breaux Landrieu Kyl Lott Burns Bryan Lautenberg Campbell Bumpers Leahy Lugar Mack Levin Chafee Byrd Cleland McCain Lieberman Coats Cochran McConnell Conrad Mikulski Collins Murkowski Dodd Moseley-Braun Moynihan Coverdell Nickles Dorgan Craig Roberts Durbin Murray D'Amato Roth Feingold Reed DeWine Santorum Feinstein Reid EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE: Domenici Sessions Ford Robb Enzi Shelby Glenn Rockefeller 1—Official Business Faircloth Smith, Bob Graham Sarbanes 2—Necessarily Absent Smith Gordon Harkin Frist Torricelli 3—Illness Gorton Snowe Hollings Wellstone 4—Other Gramm Specter Inouye Wyden Grams Stevens SYMBOLS: Grassley Thomas AY—Announced Yea Thompson Gregg AN-Announced Nav Hagel Thurmond PY-Paired Yea Hatch Warner Helms PN-Paired Nay

VOTE NO. 107 JUNE 19, 1997

tax cut bill reaches the floor, we will be ready to remind them of their support for this amendment when we propose amendments to make that bill more fair. We urge adoption of this amendment.

While favoring the amendment, some Senators expressed the following reservations:

We have no quarrel with the Senator's amendment; no Senator will support any bill that he or she does not think is "fair" in its impact on Americans based on their income or based on any other factor. However, disagreements will always arise because there will always be different interpretations on what is fair. For instance, some Senators seem to think that a tax cut bill should include tax "refunds" to welfare recipients who do not pay any taxes, because they do not think it would be distributionally "fair" if they did not benefit. Other Senators believe such "refunds" would be nothing more than new welfare payments. These arguments will no doubt surface when we consider the tax cut bill next week. For now, we urge the adoption of this amendment, so the Senate may return to considering the subject at hand, the Intelligence Authorization bill.

No arguments were expressed in opposition to the amendment.